



as to get possession of the two children retained by her. After examining all personal effects, and learning that the mother refused to give up the children, the detective took her, a companion of her own, with orders to spare no expense, but by all means to get the children. The detective arrived here, but on the very first day of their arrival they went to work most clamorously, for men charged with an operation requiring above all things stealthy acuteness. On the very first day of their arrival here, they proceeded to besiege the house, and the last thing the detective specially calculated to distract attention, and make it difficult to get the children out into the street, they went away. On the following day, however, they returned, and meeting the nurse of the lady, they offered to give her \$1,000 if she would bring the children outside the yard.

This operation failed utterly, for the nurse, frightened at her by the extraordinary appearance of the offer, and the appearance of the husband of the child, who was entering the house and taking his wife's manuscript. This lady's scruples were at once aroused, and she forthwith sent for a policeman. But before the municipal minister arrived, several neighbors, who had learned the state of affairs, interfered, and advised the "detectives" to make themselves "scarce," which kind advice was immediately acted upon, and the detective, Dr. George W. Matisell, came to the rescue of the children. In due time the husband appeared upon the stage in persona satoria, and made his application in regular judicial form for the care, custody and control of the children. His leading reason for making this appeal to the court was, that the wife was an unfit, unsafe and dangerous person to be entrusted with such custody. His accusation of conduct unbecoming, discrediting the character of the wife, and an accusation of having no evidence on which these charges rest. The court entertained the motion made by the husband for the possession of the children, and directed that the proper examination be had for the legal solution of the problem. Meanwhile, and pending the decision upon the motion, the children were ordered into the custody of the court. The more vital portions of the evidence on the question could only be had by sending the children to New York, and hence commissions were ordered to take the needed testimony in New York. That testimony has been taken, and is now on judicial file here. This motion by the husband was made in the Marion Commission Piccas of Indians, and though the evidence has been quickly transmitted from New York to the affected court, yet by a peculiar construction of the law, it was held to be necessary to have the trial, hiding-place of that evidence, and it wandered into a full-blown view of the mystery. The whole case, from the hidden glances I was able to give it, presents indeed a dish of highly seasoned viands. The parties appear to sustain the highest social and personal relations to the "first families" of New York, the husband ranking with her millionaires, and the wife tracing back her ancestral blood to the old dignity and gentility of Manhattan. On the motion for the custody of the children, the suit is pressed.

Mrs. GEORGE W. SOUTHWICK.

Against Louis C. Southwick, his wife, and Ellen Hines, the nurse of Mrs. Southwick's children. The nurse is thus included in the defense, more it is likely, to satisfy the forms of the law, than its spirit.

Mrs. Louise C. Southwick is the real defendant, whose name will doubtless be at once recognized by your numerous city readers, as will also that of her husband, Mr. George W. Southwick. From the evidence, at which I have been favored with a peep, it appears that the husband, a man of great ability, has cast his lot in that Southern family, a familiar combination of "fire-side relations." The character of the husband was evidently to prove the worthlessness of his wife's character, as a fit custodian of the children in question, and to do this, the first witness, whose evidence he submitted to the court here, was that of Peter Eder, a colored gent, who had officiated as steward in Mr. Southwick's family in New York, and who was a man of very strong and upright character, and pointed against Mrs. Southwick. On cross-examination, shuns fearfully and very like an after-collapse, under the searching fire of the cross-examination, so that the steward's story on behalf of his employer, has very much the appearance of a lesson learned for the occasion, and to capture the children *ad hominem*, regardless of that simple and straightforward truth, that a straight-forward witness is always an unfeignedly honest witness. But let us see what the colored Peter Eder, with his mind unconfused and unshocked by the opposing counsel, has to say in support of his master's motion on the direct examination. This witness, after stating that he is thirty years of age and has been with Mr. Southwick for five years, and that he has acted as steward for Mr. Southwick for the past two years as an *apprentice*. He has of course known Mr. and Mrs. Southwick throughout this period, and still Hines, the nurse who is coupled with Mrs. Southwick in the defense, having entered the family after the witness had engaged in it as steward, is known for a somewhat shorter portion of the time, and the number of children of these contestants, while the husband is known to have been four, and that their names are Caroline, George, Arthur, Ellis and Berwick. He does not know their ages, but one of the daughters appears to be a young woman, who has reached the age of marriageable maturity. The witness states that he first made the discovery of a difficulty in the family about a year ago, though before that time they did not live in a very happy home. For a long time after making his first discovery, he was unable to solve the precise nature of the family trouble, but he saw a few young men there by the name of Ohi every day. They consist of an uncle and his nephews, and they would be there from nine o'clock in the morning, till about four in the afternoon, and then would go home. In the evening they would return, and then stay generally till ten o'clock. After that hour the witness could not tell how long they would stay, but they were to bed.

The names of these friendly visitors are given as Adolphus Ohi, Fred. Ohi, and Harry Ohi. The Christian name of the fourth member of the party would not give. He went on to state that he had seen Mrs. Southwick sitting in the lap of Adolphus Ohi, while the latter had his arm around the lady's neck. He had also seen the pair drinking when together in the dining room. When Mrs. S. was sitting in the lap of Adolphus, she was in the front position. No one could be seen with them in the morning, before the lady had met her son, who had stolen goods at the expense of the family. Mrs. S. got up from Adolphus' lap. Again the witness averred, that he had on another occasion seen Mrs. Southwick standing on the floor, while Adolphus was lying on the sofa, with his hand in extremely suspicious proximity to the lady's neck. The only witness went on further to assert, that when the husband Adolphus Ohi entered Mrs. Southwick's bedroom she was lying on the floor in the morning, before the lady had met her son, who had stolen goods at the expense of the family. The witness stated that it was about ten months ago, when Adolphus Ohi and his brothers first began to visit Mrs. Southwick's house. Mrs. Southwick had sent for them, to come in to fill out a set to dance. This initial acquaintance took place in the spring of the year, and about five months before Mrs. Southwick left Mr. Southwick.

**AN ABSURD ANSWER.**

is also disclosed in this evidence, in which it is stated, that on a certain Monday, about 4 o'clock p.m., Mr. Adolphus Ohi assaulted Mr. Southwick in his own house. The witness had left the lunch on the table on that day, and recognized these as participants in the luncheon on that occasion, Miss Alice Wadsworth, and Mrs. Wadsworth, Adolphus Ohi, Mrs. Southwick, and Mr. Southwick. Adolphus Ohi, acting on the lunch, the witness went to the stable for a carriage and horses. Mrs. Southwick had sent him for the carriage and horses to drive the ladies, Miss Carrie Southwick and Alice Wadsworth, to the Park. When the witness went to the Park, he left at the house Mrs. Southwick and Adolphus Ohi, with the nurse, Ellen Hines, and Berwick, one of the other children. At the aforementioned luncheon, the refreshments were served by the husband and wife. Two pairs of steers were present to season the entertainment. On another occasion, Mr. Joseph Wadsworth was found by Mr. Southwick concealed in the barrel room of the latter's mansion, with the door barricaded, that Mr. Southwick and the witness could not shove it open. After a hard trial, the steward and Mrs. Southwick had rung the bell to get in, and there found Joseph Wadsworth concealed in room. Mr. S. wadsworth said him why he came to his house after being forbidden to enter it, to which

the covert Wadsworth is said to have replied, that he had been invited in by his wife.

It is further stated, that when Ohi first visited Mrs. Southwick's house frequently, when he was very much under the influence of liquor.

His general conduct at the house was marked by his walking up and down the parlors with Mrs. Southwick hanging on his arm, and drinking whiskey at the sideboard. During the winter of 1866, the key to that sideboard was sometimes kept by Mrs. Southwick, who intended to use it to gain the children out of the house.

On the very first day of their arrival they went to work most clamorously, for men charged with an operation requiring above all things stealthy acuteness.

On the very first day of their arrival here, they proceeded to besiege the house, and the last thing the detective specifically calculated to distract attention, and make it difficult to get the children out into the street, they went away. On the following day, however, they returned, and meeting the nurse of the lady, they offered to give her \$1,000 if she would bring the children outside the yard.

This operation failed utterly, for the nurse,

frightened at her by the extraordinary appearance of the offer, and the appearance of the husband of the child, who was entering the house and taking his wife's manuscript. This lady's scruples were at once aroused, and she forthwith sent for a policeman.

But before the municipal minister arrived, several neighbors, who had learned the state of affairs, interfered, and advised the "detectives" to make themselves "scarce," which kind advice was immediately acted upon, and the detective, Dr. George W. Matisell, came to the rescue of the children. In due time the husband appeared upon the stage in persona satoria, and made his application in regular judicial form for the care, custody and control of the children. His leading reason for making this appeal to the court was, that the wife was an unfit, unsafe and dangerous person to be entrusted with such custody. His accusation of conduct unbecoming, discrediting the character of the wife, and an accusation of having no evidence on which these charges rest. The court entertained the motion made by the husband for the possession of the children, and directed that the proper examination be had for the legal solution of the problem.

Meanwhile, and pending the decision upon the motion, the children were ordered into the custody of the court. The more vital portions of the evidence on the question could only be had by sending the children to New York, and hence commissions were ordered to take the needed testimony in New York. That testimony has been taken, and is now on judicial file here. This motion by the husband was made in the Marion Commission Piccas of Indians, and though the evidence has been quickly transmitted from New York to the affected court, yet by a peculiar construction of the law, it was held to be necessary to have the trial, hiding-place of that evidence, and it wandered into a full-blown view of the mystery. The whole case, from the hidden glances I was able to give it, presents indeed a dish of highly seasoned viands. The parties appear to sustain the highest social and personal relations to the "first families" of New York, the husband ranking with her millionaires, and the wife tracing back her ancestral blood to the old dignity and gentility of Manhattan. On the motion for the custody of the children, the suit is pressed.

MR. GEORGE W. SOUTHWICK.

Against Louis C. Southwick, his wife, and Ellen Hines, the nurse of Mrs. Southwick's children. The nurse is thus included in the defense, more it is likely, to satisfy the forms of the law, than its spirit.

Mrs. Louise C. Southwick is the real defendant, whose name will doubtless be at once recognized by your numerous city readers, as will also that of her husband, Mr. George W. Southwick. From the evidence, at which I have been favored with a peep, it appears that the husband, a man of great ability, has cast his lot in that Southern family, a familiar combination of "fire-side relations."

The character of the husband was evidently to prove the worthlessness of his wife's character, as a fit custodian of the children in question, and to do this, the first witness, whose evidence he submitted to the court here, was that of Peter Eder, a colored gent, who had officiated as steward in Mr. Southwick's family in New York, and who was a man of very strong and upright character, and pointed against Mrs. Southwick.

On cross-examination, shuns fearfully and very like an after-collapse, under the searching fire of the cross-examination, so that the steward's story on behalf of his employer, has very much the appearance of a lesson learned for the occasion, and to capture the children *ad hominem*, regardless of that simple and straightforward truth, that a straight-forward witness is always an unfeignedly honest witness.

But let us see what the colored Peter Eder, with his mind unconfused and unshocked by the opposing counsel, has to say in support of his master's motion on the direct examination. This witness, after stating that he is thirty years of age and has been with Mr. Southwick for five years, and that he has acted as steward for Mr. Southwick for the past two years as an *apprentice*.

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"No. I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.

"Yes, I have done all I have to say."

He was then asked if he had finished all he had to say.



